DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 967 SP 030 349

AUTHOR Hursh, David
TITLE Progress and Problems in Becoming Reflective: An Ethnographic Study of Pre-Service Elementary Teachers.
PUB DATE 9 Apr 88
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Critical Thinking; Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; Ethics; Higher Education; *Metacognition; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Development; *Student Teachers; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Reflective Teaching

ABSTRACT

This ethnographic study responds to concerns that the goal of developing reflective teachers is unrealistic given the practical concerns of preservice teachers. The study examines what should be meant by "reflective teaching" and whether or not teachers can become "reflective." The aim of the research was to understand if and how preservice teachers become more reflective, and the relationship between the preservice teacher, the teacher education program, and the broader social context. The setting for the study was an elementary education program at a large midwestern university which specifically aims to develop reflective teachers. After offering a definition of "reflective teaching", a description is given of the progress and problems that preservice teachers face in becoming reflective teachers. The research demonstrates that preservice teachers cannot make sense of teaching without incorporating ethical and critical criteria into their observations. In order to understand the difficulties that teachers face in becoming reflective, the study situates them within the teacher education program and the larger social millieu of social and ethical concerns. Some implications for teacher education are discussed. (Twenty-eight references are listed.) (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED296967

PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS IN BECOMING REFLECTIVE: AN ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY OF PRE-SERVICE ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

David Hursh, University of Wisconsin- Madison

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Hursh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP030349

Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Meeting, New Orleans, LA, April 9, 1988

We know that "reflective teaching" has entered the lexicon of teacher educators when it is entered in the index of the program of the American Educational Research Association. Reflective teaching has become increasingly popular and is now embraced by educators as diverse as van Manen, Cruickshank, Zeichner, Smyth and the Holmes Group. [1] Reflective teaching may be embraced, in part, because there is no accepted definition of reflective teaching, allowing proponents to sound progressive without fear of offending anyone. While the goal of developing reflective teachers has become more popular, other teacher educators caution that the goal of developing reflective teachers (whatever its meaning) is unrealistic given the practical concerns of preservice teachers. (Fuller, 1969, Berliner, 1988)

The ethnographic study described below begins to respond to the above concerns. What should we mean by "reflective teaching" and can teachers become "reflective"? The aim of the research is to understand if and how preservice teachers become more reflective and the relationship between the preservice teachers, the teacher education program and the social context. I begin by describing the research setting and methodology. Then, after offering a definition of reflective teaching, I describe the progress and problems that preservice teachers face in becoming reflective teachers. While it is not surprising that preservice teachers do not succeed in becoming reflective teachers as I define it, the research demonstrates not only that preservice teachers cannot make sense of teaching without incorporating

ethical and critical criteria into their observations, analysis and practice, but that some explicitly desire to do so. In order to understand the difficulties that teachers face in becoming reflective, they are situated within the teacher education program and the larger social milieu. Lastly, I conclude with some implications for teacher education.

RESEARCH SETTING AND METHODOLOGY

The setting for the ethnographic study was an elementary education program at a large midwestern university. The program specifically aims to develop reflective teachers. The eight students selected for the study were college seniors who had completed one year in the teacher education program and were beginning the fall semester of their last year. They had completed mandatory courses, such as "Introduction to Elementary Education," the practicum and methods classes in language arts and reading and most of their electives courses in drama, art, mainstreaming, educational psychology and policy studies. The students were beginning their second practicum; in addition they were taking social studies, math and science methods and one or two other courses. Seven of the eight students selected for the study were enrolled in the same social studies methods class; the eighth student was enrolled in a different section taught by the same instructor. The students were selected from social studies methods because it seemed the most likely methods class in which issues of the social nature of the curriculum would be discussed. All eight

students had the same supervisor for the practicum and seminar that complemented the methods class.

Selection criteria in forming the original group of eight students included studying at least two males (as it turned out three males were selected -- an over representation of the percentage of males in the program), and a two students who, after high school, joined the workforce for three to eight years before going on to college. Furthermore, some recognizable diversity in political views was sought. Four students had made "political" (the nature of which is described below) comments in the social studies methods class and all had completed, for the same class, a thirty item questionnaire on their political opinions. Two students were selected because they had described themselves as liberals and two students were selected because they had described themselves as conservatives.

In the spring semester four of the eight students, chosen at random, were followed with monthly hour- long interviews and observations of their student teaching and university seminar. The four not chosen for observation during the second semester were interviewed at the beginning and end of the semester. Because the aim was to show how preservice students become reflective, supervisors and instructors were chosen for the study who had university teaching experience and were generally viewed positively by students and colleagues.

Methods of gathering data included formal and informal interviews of the university instructors, the eight students and a few other students interested in the study, observations of the

eight students during their practice teaching and of all the preservice students in the university classes, and a review of program related materials.

REDEFINING REFLECTIVE TEACHING

Reflective teaching needs to be defined both so that we know what it is and so that we can assess whether preservice teachers do become reflective. The university's conception of reflective teaching originates in conceptions offered by van Manen (1977) and Dewey (1933). Van Manen, building on Habermas, describes three levels of knowledge: the technical, the practical and the emancipatory. Technical knowledge, the lowest level, is described as the effective application of knowledge for the purpose of attaining ends that are accepted as given. The second level is based on a conception of practical action "where the problem is one of explicating and clarifying the assumptions and predispositions underlying practical affairs and assessing the educational consequences toward which action leads." Emancipatory knowledge is described as the goal of the program, for at this level the central question is "which educational goals, experiences and activities lead toward forms of life which are mediated by concerns for justice" and fulfillment.

The university program also incorporates into their description Dewey's distinction between reflectve and routine action. For Dewey, routine action is guided by "tradition, external authority and circumstances." In contrast, reflective action entails the active, persistent and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in light of the grounds

that support it and the further consequences to which it leads." (1933: 4)

While van Manen's description of reflective thinking and Dewey's description of reflective teaching offers one definition, they are inadequate in several respects. A more accurate and useful description of thinking and teaching can be developed. Noffke (1986) criticizes van Manen's three levels of reflectivity for their disconnected hierarchical nature. She questions whether preservice teachers begin at the technical level, add the practical and then reach the critical level. Furthermore, she questions whether thinking of the different kinds of teaching as levels doesn't imply that the practical is less important when, in fact, the practical is required for putting the other aspects of teaching thinking into practice.

Consequently, reflective teaching is redefined as encompassing practical, ethical and critical dimensions. [2] Practical knowledge, which may include science, skills, craft and art, answers the question of how to do something but can also be understood as phronesis, or practice informed by ethical and critical knowledge. Teachers implicitly and sometimes explicitly use ethical considerations in making decisions about their classroom practice. Karen, a preservice teacher described below, exemplifies one ethical approach in that she uses an ethic of caring similar to that described by Noddings. Noddings (1984) argues that "human caring and the memory of caring and being cared for, form the foundation of ethical response." This approach to ethics differs from the second more traditional analytical

approach to ethics of utilitarian or contractual theories. While different from an ethic of caring, contractual ethical theories, such as that of Rawls (1971) or Nozick (1974), may be helpful to teachers in assessing the morality of ability grouping, testing, and funding.

A third possible ethical approach criticizes liberal democratic contractual theories as contributing to a individualistic, instrumental and analytical view of society; rather, than emphasizing the development of ethics and ethical practice within the process of developing democratic social processes and institutions. Landon Beyer writes that phronesis-- practical knowledge combined with critical and ethical knowledge-- is "the grounding of knowledge within the community of discussants [and] sees ethical and political debates as central to such communities. The crucial question becomes what kind of world we ought to construct with our fellow human beings- hence the centrality of ethical and political theory." (1986) The ethical and critical dimensions inform us as to what democratic practice might be like. This third approach explicitly incorporates a critical dimension into reflective teaching.

The critical dimension requires that teachers realize that the nature of society is problematical, that knowledge is contested and is related to the interests and views of specific social groups, and that politics should not be relegated to a narrow political sphere, but, rather, that all of society is political, consisting of conflicts and contradictions. [3] Consequently, teachers who incorporate the critical dimension

into their teaching realize that teaching inherently includes unresolvable societal demands, that the nature of schooling is an outcome of political conflicts and that there is no one final answer to what should be the purposes, processes and content of schooling. As James McDonald stated, "(A)ll curriculum design and development in political in nature." (1975)

Finally, the concept of phronesis requires that teachers develop all three dimensions of reflective teaching in concert. That is, each informs the other; no one dimension can advance very far without being tested in the other dimensions. For example, preservice teachers, in reading Howard Zinn's A People's History of the United States (1980), Gary Nash's The Private Side of American History (1975), or a history text in women's studies, realize that most history textbooks neglect the history of thenonelite and everyday life. This new critical understanding -- that written history is selective and ideological -- may prompt them to wonder how historical knowledge is used to either legitimate or undermine social inequalities. These critical and ethical concerns lead to practical concerns: How do you teach other, non-textbook versions of history? At what age can students understand that written history is selective and how do you teach that? As preservice teachers modift their practice, their understanding of the nature of history or the ethical and critical issues of historical analysis may progress.

THEORIZING TEACHER SOCIALIZATION

My reconceptualization of reflective teaching requires rethinking the process of teacher socialization. Because it

assumes that teachers develop novel ways of thinking about and practicing teaching, it contrasts with functionalist and interpretivist theories of teacher socialization. Functionalist role theory tends to describe teacher socialization as a process of adopting the accepted characteristics of the profession. (Giddens, 1979) Consequently, functionalist role theories grant teachers little power in defining their own profession. Symbolic interactionists correct the functionalist's overemphasis on fitting the individual into society but err in the opposite direction, systematically failing "to question the relationship between education, practice and the organization of occupational groups." Symbolic interactionists "have been unable to handle the issue of knowledge and to generate a sociological perspective on the curriculum." (Atkinson and Delamont, 1985: 317)

Atkinson and Delamont argue for a research approach that reflects teacher education as the result of "selective impositions" (emphasis in original) embodying the "interests and perspectives of competing segments." (1985: 317) In developing an alternative conception of teacher socialization, critical social theorists have attempted to reconceptualize the relationship between the individual and society that priviledges neither and permits both the reproduction and transformation of society. John Thompson, in Studies in the Theory of Ideology, concisely describes the theoretical issue:

> "What must be grasped is not how structure determines action [functionalism] or how a combination of actions make up a structure

> [interpretivism], but how action is structured in everyday contexts and how the structured features of action are, by the very performance of an action, thereby reproduced." (1984: 148-9)

This relation between the structured features of action and the reproduction of structure through actions describes Anthony Giddens' notion of the "duality of structure." Giddens describes the "duality of structure" as "the essential recursiveness of social life, as constituted in social practices: structure is both the medium and outcome of the reproduction of practices, and 'exists' in the generating moments of this constitution." (1979:5)

Giddens describes the social structure as including both discourse and ongoing social institutions. If we are to understand individual actions, we need to analyze both behavior and language and the historically contingent social institutions. Preservice teachers learn about teaching within a specific discourse and historically situated institutional structure. We cannot understand teaching without also situating teaching within a larger social context. Given the task of both understanding the discourse and institutional structure of teacher education, the university classes were analyzed as to how they covered the different aspects of reflective teaching and how the institutional structure of teacher education facilitated or inhibited teacher reflectiveness.

In the next section I will describe two preservice teachers who became more reflective over time. While both students became more reflective, they came into the program from two very

different perspectives and took two different routes towards reflectivity. Karen's ethical concerns first had practical and then critical implications. Paul's critical concerns guided his thinking about the purposes and content of teaching. The description of the students will be followed by a brief description of their university classes and difficulties students had in combining the three dimensions of reflective teaching. Theconcluding section will offer some tentative explanations for understanding the progess and problems of becoming reflective and some recommendations for change.

KAREN

Like many students, Karen describes herself as initially entering teacher education because she cares about children. She states: "I came in with the idea that you just have to love kids." She justifies this approach by adding that students need a lot of love and that to teach you "have to step back and put yourself in their perspective and how you felt when you were first learning." [date of interview or observation: [9-18, 1986]

But in her "Introduction to Elementary Education" class, Karen learns that while one does have to love children, love is not enough. She begins to realize the responsiblity and decision making that teaching requires, and to doubt, for a moment, whether she can "handle it." Karen decides to continue and uses her caring for children to inform her analysis of schooling and teaching practices. For example, in her first practicum she

disapproves of the uncaring and brusque manner of the first grade cooperating teacher. She is offended when the teacher intentionally embarrasses a student by publicly commenting on his body odor, nor does she approve of how the teacher simply points to the door to indicate to a misbehaving child that he should leave. Since Karen would never intentionally embarrass a student, she would never punish a student without first holding "his hand and asking him why he felt that way." [9-18]

This caring for students forms the basis for evaluating herself and others as teachers. "I try, she says, "to treat people like I want to be treated." She relates that she observed one class where a "little boy had a very important thing he wanted to contribute to the class, raised his hand and the teacher just totally ignored it and ...the expression on the boy's face was like he was so disappointed." [9-18] This desire to know what students are thinking and feeling provides a rationale beyond that offered in methods courses in social studies and science for using inquiry lessons. She says that she wants

> to get them to ask questions and come up with solutions and work better at communication skills in a group....I do care a lot about how people feel and I'm always listening to their opinions and I feel what other people say is important because you have to be appreciated and accepted for what you are. [11-14]

In her practicum she develops several lessons requiring students to ask questions, think creatively and discuss in small and large groups.

During her student teaching in fourth grade, she continues her analysis of teaching and improves in teaching practices. For example, she rearranges the desks from rows into groups of four so that she can have students work cooperatively. In reading, she substitutes trade books for basals because "you can be more critical with trade books." You don't have to "concentrate so heavily on the skills. We skill them to death." [5-4-87] She develops and teaches a science unit on oceans and ocean life that makes use of the text but centers on experiments and films. She continues to assess whether her classroom content and organization respects students' knowledge and feelings and discourages divisiveness and competition.

Karen welcomes suggestions from her cooperating teacher, whose political and religous views are different from her own. An atheist and politically active in groups such as "Educators for Social Responsiblity," he sees his classroom as an environment where children can learn to repect each other and the world around them. Karen's willingness to learn from her cooperating teacher seems even more remarkable given that she describes herself as a conservative Christian desiring to reinstate prayer in schools.

Her cooperating teacher, however, immediately sensed their differences and similarities. He describes Karen "as wearing her religion on her sleeve." Immediately after they began discussing the possibility of her student teaching in his room, he states: "I

think you should know that I'm an atheist." Even though "caring" comes from different sources, hers out of a desire to create the church on earth, his from "a concern for the human race," they aresimilar in their caring for students. [5-20-87] Karen acknowledges their religious and political differences but describes her cooperating teacher as a "tremendous, great influence on my teaching because of his personal manner with the kids. He respects them first." [5-4-87]

Karen takes one possible route towards reflectiveness. She comes to teaching caring about children, wanting to treat them the way she would want to be treated. Her desire to be a caring teacher leads her to become critical of many aspects of schooling: classroom competition and lessons that stifle student thinking and feeling. Karen leaves the program having developed some practical skills that reflect her ethical and critical concerns.

PAUL

Paul comes to teaching from a different direction than Karen. While he thinks that caring about children is important, he immediately raises critical issues. For example, he dislikes the coercion in schools to think and act one way. Early in the year he describes how students are "corralled together to think in a certain way," made to think "that if you're different from the group, it's not good." [9-29-86] Later in the year, when a fellow student teacher relates that a recalcitrant seventh grader said "school sucks," Paul concurs. "He's right; it does. Now the task is to make it sound good." [2-11-87]

When student teaching in a combined first and second grade, he willingly sharea authority with students. In one lesson, for example, students provide him with a list of 'O' words and then tell him whether they belong in the short or long 'O' columns. A student offers a teacher's name for the list, but they can't decide whether it has a short or long 'O'. Paul finally says: "To tell you the truth, I'm not quite sure." [2-16-87] He then follows a student's suggestion to place the name between the two columns. Later in the semester he tells me that he "wants the locus of control to move to students...I'm not the big cheese; they're not here for us." [3-3-87]

In desiring to respect both the students' and his own knowledge, he combines his analysis of schooling with an ethical concern for children. Both concerns are reflected when hedescribes his aim as showing students: "I care about you; this matters." He values both children and knowledge.

His willingness to share authority combined with his desire to make learning enjoyable, results in a unique classroom style. In a lesson near the end of a dinosaur unit, he feigns ignorance to draw out what the students have learned by exclaiming,

> I'm from another planet. I'm from Zeno. I want you to tell me about dinosaurs. How did scientists know there were dinosaurs on the earth? How did humans figure it out?" A girl responds "from school." Paul: "Who told them?" Girl: "Scientists." Paul: "How did they learn?" Girl: "From fossils." [3-19-87]

To break the everyday classroom routine, he changes his language and behavior. When some students from a neighboring room join his class for a lesson he begins with, "OK, gang, welcome to my room." [2-16-87] For another lesson he wears a plastic pig nose. He playfully ends one conversation with a student with "Okie, dokie, artichokie." Paul has a sense of humor and wants to use it. "Adults have," he says, "a sense of humor. Why not show it in the classroom? Why can't you be a clown during the day?" [12-10-86]

Paul works at making his teaching practice match his critical ideals, while at the same time, his experience leads to a rethinking of the purposes of schooling. For example, he initially believes that "teachers can be anybody they want to be." [12-10-86] Later he is more realistic, realizing that there are limits to what is permitted and to his own energy.

The cases of Karen and Paul provide two examples of preservice teachers becoming more reflective. Karen initially approaches teaching out of an ethic of caring and reformulates her analysis and practice in light of that ethic. She feels that the existing classroom practices inadequately reflect her feelings towards children. In trying to understand why classrooms are the way they are, she begins to place schooling within a larger social context. Already critical of schooling, and as he develops his practice, Paul reformulates his analysis. He tests out what is and is not possible for a beginning teacher. As student teachers, both were obviously helped by cooperating teachers who encouraged an analysis of teaching in the critical, ethical and

practical dimensions. Both described the teacher education program as less helpful than their student teaching.

THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

While Paul and Karen became more reflective, the teacher education program was only partially successful in helping them become so. Social studies methods might be expected to be the one class most helpful in drawing the connections between the practical, critical and ethical aspects of teaching. Social studies offers ample opportunities to analyze the ethical and critical implications of various curriculum content and processes. Besides the example given above regarding history, questions about the content and process of social studies methods can be most easily related to the larger issues of the ethical and critical implications of how and what to teach.

The social studies methods class had thirty students and met 25 times over the semester. Class periods were mostly devoted to large group discussion except for the last four sessions during which small groups of students presented information on teaching various subjects, such as the Great Depression, overpopulation, alcohol, drug abuse and suicide. The instructor had two main goals for the class- to increase students' knowledge about current events and politics and to introduce students to the "inquiry method" of teaching social studies. The former goal was reflected in current events discussions for the first fourth to one half of each two hour class, while the latter goal was met by his presenting less than a half dozen examples of inquiry lessons.

The following excerpts should give a flavor of the kinds of discussions that occurred in the social studies methods class. The first excerpt is typical of the current events discussions, the second excerpt represents a typical discussion of social studies methods, and the last excerpt depicts an atypical discussion in which students raised critical, ethical and practical issues.

CURRENT EVENTS

The instructor begins by asking "what's in the news?" A student, Ted, responds that the hearings are beginning on Rhenquist's nomination for Chief Justice. Ted adds that Rhenquist is "kind of shady, he descriminates against women and minorities." [Later in the semester this same student claims that he doesn't believe that discrimination exists.] Mr. Baker asks if the other students know who they're talking about. Most nod no. Mr. Baker explains who Rhenquist is and that the liberal Democrats are against him, partly because of his involvement in military surveillance. Even though Ted thinks that Rhenquist might not be confirmed, the instructor feels he will be because Presidential nominees are rarely rejected.

Another student, John, mentions "Reagan's war on drugs." Debb, who has a previous degree in social work, says she listened to his speech and questions his sincerity. "I look at things dubiously" and thinks that he's discussing it because "it's a good election issue." Mr. Baker mentions that the Democrats support it and adds, "It's scary." The remainder of the current events discussion covers how many children in New York City use cocaine, raids on Bolivian cocaine fields, drug programs in schools,

anecdotes about kids that use alcohol, terrorist bombings and the upcoming gubernatorial election. [9-16]

METHODS

While news discussions took up almost half of the classes, students also viewed and discussed six videotapes made by Native Americans living in the state and four of the films from the Man: A Course of Study series. On most occasions the discussions of MACOS and otherteaching resources did not raise ethical and critical issues. But on some occasions, such as the one below, the students did attempt to connect the different dimensions of teacher thinking. In response to the question of what they think of MACOS a student responds:

> MACOS encourages questioning, inquiry... students shouldn't be taught blindly to obey." Instructor: "We have to teach students to question authority. What is the purpose of the program?" Ted: "Tells about eskimos." Doris: "Understand that this culture isn't the only one." Sara raises the question of whether and how you would use MACOS in a community where students aren't encouraged to question. Paul [the same Paul described above] says that's "it's the background of all of us, of man," and that we need to present evolution. Sara vehemently objects that "we didn't come from fish and I don't want that bullshit taught to my kids." John doesn't want Paul teaching evolution unless he also teaches creationism. Instructor: "People have to consider parents and what they believe..it

[evolution] is a theory." Raising the issue of whether you have to teach both sides or take into account community values, Beth asks "Are you going to teach prejudice just because the community hates blacks? Where do you draw the line?" John answers, "You can't present one; give them both sides and let them decide." [9-30]

In the excerpt above John, Paul and Sara debate whether evolutionism should be taught. They raise but don't resolve the question of whether and how one teaches a subject over which there are conflicting views. Can one ethically justify providing students with information which may go against their family beliefs? On the other hand, can one teach only one view? Do preservice teachers know enough about the nature of science to justify a particular view, such as evolution, as more scientific? Beth raises the ethical implications of this debate by asking whether teachers should just assent to the values of the majority of the community if those values are unethical? John's answer, that you present all sides, is not quite satisfactory and the discussion ends unresolved. Students haphazardly attempt to incorporate the dimensions of reflective teaching. We see that some students are attempting to incorporate practical, ethical and critical thinking into their teaching.

HISTORY

Another example from a preservice teacher's history lesson further reveals their difficulties in combining the ethical, critical and practical.

Ted is outlining the Mexican-American War with his seventh grade students. His method of teaching is to ask students questions- the answers to which they may read from the textbooks open before them. The content of his lesson presents a view of the war as just and necessary if the United States is to fulfill its "manifest destiny." The first four minutes of the lesson:

Ted [T]: "Open your books and be ready to outline section Three." He has written on the overhead projector: "I. The annexation of Texas angers Mexico."

T: "What was one of the points of the annexation of Texas?" Student [St]: "Mexico's political leaders expected it."

T: "When did it happen?"

St: "1845."

T: "After we annexed Texas what happened with Mexico and the U.S. before the war?"

St: "Mexico broke off relations."

Ted writes on the overhead "A. 1845: U.S. annexes Mexico. B. Mexico broke off relations with the U.S. II. Manifest Destiny."

T: "What does that mean?"

St: "Fate."

T: "What was fate about?"

St: "Expansion."

T: "They wanted to expand." He writes: "A. Expansionist" on the overhead. [4-2-87]

This was Ted's typical approach to teaching social studies, an approach about which questions could be raised but never were. For example, in her excellent study of the teaching of secondary social studies, Linda McNeil (1983) would question whether the format of the lesson, in which history is presented as discrete, disconnected facts, makes knowledge inaccessible. Students are unlikely to make sense of or care about history presented in this manner. Furthermore, the content of the lesson itself presents a one sided and unproblematic view of a war of questionable aims and methods, and over which there was significant civilian and military opposition.

At the end of the semester I raise the issue of whether he isn't presenting an overly consensual view of history, adding that some historians, such as Howard Zinn (1980), describe the war in less positive terms. "I suppose," Ted says, "if the textbook isn't right but we don't know whether that book [Zinn's] is biased." [4-27-87] Ted has not gained from the teacher education program the ability to critically analyze whose interests might benefit from different versions of history or that it might be useful to have students look deeply into the significance of events. His assignment at the end of the class symbolically represents his approach to history. He has the students draw a map of Texas before and after it gained independence and include in the map a picture of the Alamo, the Texas state flag and the name of the President. History is reduced to symbols. [4]

THE DEPOLITICIZATION OF PEDAGOGY

The above excerpts suggest numerous possible explanations for why preservice teachers may have problems connecting the three dimensions of relective teaching. Since they cannot all be adequately addressed in a paper of this length, I shall here only briefly point out how the students' discussion and understanding of politics and ethics contributes to separating critical and ethical issues from classroom pedagogy.

On the one hand, most of the students enjoyed the current events discussions and felt that current events was something they did not know but should know. On the other hand they didn't know how to relate these discussion to teaching. In fact, how a political analysis might increase their own understanding of schools was left largely unexplored.

The dichotomy between politics and pedagogy in the teacher education program can be explained in several ways. In the first place, differing political views are understood not as differing views of the purposes of society, ethical stances or descriptions of the relationship between the economy and democracy. Instead, one is "just" a Democrat or a Republican, and the difference is more one of belief or style rather than logic or substance. Debb, who as stated above has a previous degree in social work, related in an interview her frustration with the lack of justification inclass for political positions. She stated that the instructor doesn't help one think it through but almost makes it seem that one's decision on specific issues comes down to whether one is a Democrat or Republican. [9-25] Other students described politics

as a matter of style or personal opinion. For example, Karen [described above] defines Mr. Baker as:

> a liberal because he's pretty open minded. I think I see him more conserative as a person [as opposed to poltically] because of the way he thinks about the Indian. He wants to conserve that and not forget about the people we learned from." [9-18-86]

Just previous to the above response, Karen has just described herself as a very religious person, who subscribes to The Plain Truth; she has even written to the magazine for advice on how to reinstate prayer in schools. In reponse to further questioning about how she would describe herself, she states:

> I like to make waves but on certain issues I'm more towards the radical side." Question: "So you define liberal as?" Karen: "Tolerant and open minded and vocal. Liberal as being able to express your own opinions and radical as really expressing them, as shoving them down someone's throat. Someone at a rally and they were a communist and if somebody else in the audience would express their opinion, the communist would say 'no, you're wrong, our way is the right way and you are going to see it that way.' I would say very radical, being very close minded and only lookin at your perspective. [9-18]

Karen was not alone in classifying political views not by their content but by their degree of openess and tolerance.

Secondly, this emphasis on tolerating different views and the recent revelation for some students that scientific "facts" are social constructions led to a relativism regarding values. The above discussions regarding teaching creationism or evolution and assenting to racist community beliefs and actions are two examples. Are creationism and evolutionism equally valid scientific theories? Should we attempt to teach all views, even racist ones?

Finally, the explicit relationship between politics and critical analysis of society and the practice of teaching were rarely enumerated. This was evident by the difficulty many students had in critically discussing the goals of schooling. Several students discribed their main aim as "learning to manage students" and slighted issues regarding the ethical and critical nature of the curriculum content or process. Sara stated that she learned in the methods class that one needs to justify one's political opinion. When asked if she can justify her approach to teaching, she replies that "teaching approaches are up to the individual teacher."

> Question: "Are some teaching practices better than others?" Sara: "No, you can't determine that." [5-8-87]

This lack of clarity regarding the basis for political beliefs and activity should not be surprising given the dismal condition of political life in the United States. Anthony Giddens describes how in capitalism, politics is limited to the explicitly "political sphere," and spheres, such as economics and culture, are portrayed as nonpolitical and natural. (1979: 194) Ethical

debate is similarly impoverished. Alasdair MacIntyre has described the inadequate and confused nature of our ethical discussions, arguing that "we have- very largely, if not entirely- lost our comprehension, both theoretical and practical, of morality." (1983: 2) The consequences of this political and ethical impoverishment have been described by sociologists such as Robert Bellah, et. al. in Habits of the Heart (1985) and political scientists such as William Sullivan in Reconstructing Public Philosophy (1987). Pedagogy is depoliticized, at least in part, because our society neglects to integrate debate over the purpose and organization of society into everyday activities.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

While preservice teachers' ethical and political discussions lack clarity and coherence, the above descriptions of university classrooms and preservice teachers, especially Karen and Paul, also support the notion that preserve teachers do raise and attempt to integrate the ethical, critical and practical dimensions into their teaching. If preservice teachers fail tobecome reflective, it is not necessarily that they cannot become so, but that the program may not be adequately organized to promote the process. Teacher education progams may impede reflectiveness through the artificial distinction made between foundations (potentially critical and ethical) and methods (practical). In contrast to the way teacher education is currently organized, the above analysis suggests that teacher educators could acknowledge and integrate the critical, ethical and

practical dimensions by combining educational foundations and teaching methods.

In analyzing the organizational structure of the school of education, several factors appear to impede developing "reflectiveness." First, the faculty rarely discussed and voiced no consensus over what it means to be a reflective teacher. Some instructors included politics and the politics of education while others avoided politics on any level. For example, Ms. Johnson, who taught a seminar and supervised a practicum, dismisses political analysis of education in favor of approaching teaching as an individual art. [5] Secondly, some instructors had little interest and experience in raising ethical and critical issues, in part because those issues had not been raised in their own education. Thirdly, for those individual instructors who did aim for "reflectiveness," they felt they must assume that no other faculty members had broached the subject and, therefore, they must cover it all in their class. Unfortunately, developing reflective teachers in one class is difficult if not impossible. [6]

If we look at teacher education historically, conflicting views over the purpose of teacher education exist. Borrowman (1956) describes the conflict as between the technical and the liberal. This ongoing historical struggle over the purpose of teacher education may contribute to a lack of confidence on the part of the college of education in presenting reflective teaching as a legitimate goal. Faculty are unsure whether they can justify particular views regarding the ethical, critical and practical dimensions of schooling. Without clearly stated and justified

goals, the image of teaching remains "finding your own style," value free and relative.

The above analysis helps us understand teacher socialization as an outcome of both the discourse and structure of society and social institutions. While the university instructors and preservice teachers do not simply reproduce social practices, the characteristic poverty of our political and ethical discourse inhibits the development of a critical analysis of teaching and education. This inadequacy is exacerbated by both the struggle, historically, over the purposes of teacher education and the artificial distinction made in teacher education between foundations (potentially critical and ethical) and methods (practical). This kind of analysis allows us to understand teacher socialization as neither an outcome of functionalist requirements or individual actions but as an outcome of actions with everyday structure. Teacher socialization is the result of "selective impositions" embodying the "interest and perspective of competing segments." As such, teacher education, itself, is political, and the discourse and structure teacher education can be contested.

In contrast to the ways in which teacher education is currently organized, the analysis above suggests that teacher educators could acknowledge and integrate the critical and ethical dimensions into the practical by combining educational foundations and teaching methods. Landon Beyer, in his forthcoming book Knowing and Acting: Inquiry, Ideology and Teacher Education, forcefully argues that teaching is "a reflective, foundational,

political act requiring moral judgment and commitment." (308) A reflective teacher education program could model reflective teaching by involving faculty and students in the discussion of how to develop critical, ethical and practical thinking in teachers. The program could involve preservice teachers in the analysis of their own program, analyze the economic and cultural constraints on teacher education institutions, and help to connect practice, ethics and critique.

I know in my own classes, where I encourage dialogue between students over questions ranging from the nature and purpose of society and schooling to how those are reflected in daily classes, and where I have students write journals and meet with othersoutside of class, the most powerful lesson for the students is the realization that my classroom method, the class' explicit "hidden curriculum," teaches them how classrooms can reflect the teacher's ethical and critical concerns. The medium is indeed the message.

Furthermore, I do not neglect the practical, which I think, oddly enough, is neglected at the particular institution I studied. Students need to be given suggestions of how the dimensions of reflective teaching might be integrated. For example, Karen's ethical concerns for humane discipline lead to the practical implications of developing cooperative learning and teaching practices which build on the students intrinsic motivation. Lastly, teachers need to help students think though the implications of their concerns. What are the critical and practical implications of stating that you care about children or

that you want to counter coercive conformity? Students may need help realizing the profound implications of deceptively innocent observations. This kind of teaching and teacher education requires that preservice teachers and teacher educators enter into discussions that are both theoretical and practical, thereby, promoting praxis- practical activity informed by ethical and critical knowledge.

FOOTNOTES

1- Contrasting definitions of reflective teaching are offered by Zeichner (1981-82) and Cruickshank (1985). More theoretical descriptions of reflectivity are offered by Dewey (1933), Schon (1983), and van Manen (1977).

2- This is further described in Chapter 3 of my dissertation, Becoming Teachers: Preservice Teachers Understanding of School and Society, University of Wisconsin- Madison, forthcoming, 1988.

3- Richard Bernstein (1986) describes the epistemological and ontological basis for this view and Anthony Giddens (1979) describes the social theoretical foundations and implication.

4- I am indebted to Steve Voss, one of my students, for this observation.

5- Ms. Johnson is further described in my dissertation.

6- For a description of an instructor who does attempt to integrate the practical, ethical and critical see my description of Ms. Benton in my dissertation.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, Paul and Sara Delamont, "Socialization into Teaching: The Research Which Lost its Way," British Journal of Sociology of Education, Vol. 6, No. 3, 1985.

Bellah, Robert, et. al., Habits of the Heart, New York: Harper and Row, 1985.

Berliner, David, "Facets of Pedagogical Expertize," American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Annual Meeting, New Orleans, La., 1988.

Bernstein, Richard, Beyond Objectivism and Relativism: Science, Hermenuetics and Praxis, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.

Beyer, Landon, "Beyond Elitism and Technicism: Teacher Education as Practical Philosophy," Journal of Teacher Education, March- April , 1986.

Beyer, Landon, Knowing and Acting: Inquiry, Ideology and Teacher Preparation, Philadelphia: Falmer Press, in press.

Borrowman, Merle, The Liberal and Technical in Teacher Education, New York: Teachers College Press, 1956.

Cruickshank, Douglas, "Uses and Benefits of Reflective Teaching," Phi Delta Kappa, 66(10), 1985.

Dewey, John, How We Think, Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1933.

Fuller, Francis, Concerns of Teachers: A Developmental Conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6.

Giddens, Anthony, Central Problems in Social Theory, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.

Habermas, Jurgen, Knowledge and Human Interests, Boston: Beacon, 1977.

Holmes Group, Tomorrow's Teachers, East Lansing Michigan, The Holmes Group, 1986.

MacDonald, James, "Curriculum and Human Interests," in William Pinar, ed. Curriculum Theorizing, Berekely: McCutchan, 1975.

McIntyre, Alasdair, After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory, Notre Dame: Notre Dame Press, 1984.

Popkewitz, Thomas, "Ideology and Social Formation in Teacher Education," Teaching and Teacher Education, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1985.

McNeil, Linda, "Defensive Teaching and Classroom Control," in Ideology and Practice in Schooling, Michael Apple and Lois Weis, eds., Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1983.

Nash, Gary, ed., The Private Side of American History, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975.

Noddings, Nel, Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Noffke, Susan, "The Dimensions of Reflective Teaching," unpublished manuscript, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1986.

Nozick, Robert, Anarchy, State and Utopia, New York: Basic Books, 1974.

Rawls, John, A Theory of Justice, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Schon, Donald, The Reflective Practitioner, New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Sullivan, William, Reconstructing Public Philosophy, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Thompson, John, Studies in the Theory of Ideology, Cambridge, England: Polity Press, 1984.

van Manen, Max, "Linking Ways of Knowing with Ways of Being Practical," Curriculum Inquiry, Vol. 6, No. 3, 1977.

Zeichner, Kenneth, "Reflective Teaching and Field-Based Experience in Teacher Education, Interchange, Vol. 12, No. 4, 1981-1982.

Zinn, Howard, A People's History of the United States, New York: Harper and Row, 1980.